UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/768,996 | 01/30/2004 | Suresh C. Srivastava | | 4523 |

7590 02/26/2008

SURESH C. SRIVASTAVA, PH.D.
CHEMGEMES CORPORATION
33 INDUSTRIAL WAY
WILMINGTON, MA 01887

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| FETTEROLF, BRANDON J | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1642 | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 02/26/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/768,996 | SRIVASTAVA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | BRANDON J. FETTEROLF | 1642 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *38-44* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 October 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

The Election filed on 3/03/2007 in response to the Restriction Requirement of July 29, 2005 has been entered. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-37, as specifically drawn to an oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancer cells over non-cancerous cells comprising at least two CpG moieties and a prodrug for an antimetabolite covalently linked to the oligonucleotide has been acknowledged. Applicants have further elected, with traverse, the antimetabolite agent Gemcitabine, 2'deoxy,2',2'-difluorocytidine as the species. A further election filed on 12/20/2007 in response to the Restriction Requirement of September 20, 2007 has been entered. Applicants elected, with traverse, the species corresponding to the nucleotide SEQ ID NO: 9, and its generic version, the newly added SEQ ID NO: 11. The traversal in both instances is that unity of invention exists between the compounds listed in the Markush claims.

While not fully agreeing with Applicants arguments pertaining to unity of invention, the Examiner has withdrawn the election of species portion of the previous Restriction Requirement.

Thus, the restriction requirement is therefore deemed to be proper and is made FINAL.

Claims 1-44 are pending.

Claims 38-44 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 1-37 are currently under consideration.

### *Drawings*

The drawings were received on 10/16/2004. These drawings are accepted.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the UV absorption spectra as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and

appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification on page 14, description of figures, is objected to because it fails to describe the complete content of the figures. For example, the specification teaches that FIG. 5 shows the HPLC of the sequence dFCGGACG. However, Figure 5 is separated into Figure 5A and 5B and the specification does not appear to describe what is presented in these two Figures.

The specification is further objected to, see for example page 3 of the specification that begins on line 18, for improper disclosure of nucleotide sequences without a respective sequence identifier, i.e. a SEQ ID NOs:. Hence, the disclosure fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825. In the absence of a sequence identifier for each sequence, Applicant must provide a computer readable form (CRF) copy of the sequence listing, an initial or substitute paper copy of the sequence listing, as well as any amendment directing its entry into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e-f) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

Note: Applicants amendment to the specification filed on 10/16/2004 is acknowledged which incorporated Sequence identifiers to SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. However, in view of the Applicants amendments submitted on 12/20/2007 which included a revised sequence listing, SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 have been deleted.

The use of the trademarks, for example Gemicitabine, has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the claims encompass an oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells comprising at least two CPG moieties and a prodrug for an antimetabolite covalently linked to the oligonucleotide. Therefore, the claims encompass a genus of oligonucleotides.

The Written Description Guidelines for examination of patent applications indicates, "the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical characteristics and/or other chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicant was in possession of the claimed genus." (Federal register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3) and (see MPEP 2164).

The specification teaches (page 5) that oligonucleotides of the invention include oligonucleotides which preferentially kill cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells and comprise at least two CpG moieties. In particular, the specification teaches that oligonucleotides for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells have a motif represented by the formula: 5'PGXCG3', wherien P is a prodrug for an antimetabolite and X represents between 0 and

50 nucleotides, preferably 2, 5 or 9 nucleotides (page 7). For example, the specification provides a number of oligonucleotide sequences (page 20).

The state of the prior art at the time the invention was made recognized the therapeutic potential of CpG oligodeoxynucleotides for immunotherapy. For example, Weiner (Leukocyte Biology, 2000; 68: 455-463) indicates that there is therapeutic potential in cancer treatment for CpG as an immune adjuvant (Table 1) and that there are a number of scenarios where CpG could be used as a component of cancer immunotherapy, each of these areas is under intensive investigation (p. 458, col. 1). Studies in a tumor model (38C13 murine lymphoma) indicate that CpG was just as effective as CFA at inducing an antigen-specific antibody response (p. 458, col. 2). Weiner teaches that "[P]reliminary studies suggest CpG ODN can be effective in a variety of scenarios when used alone or in combination with other agents. Despite this promise we still do not understand the molecular mechanisms responsible for the immunostimulatory effects of CpG ODN. All CpG ODN are not alike, and more needs to be learned about the heterogeneous responses that occur based on host organism, cell subset, or CpG ODN sequence. Most importantly, we have not yet explored their clinical effects. Further work with CpG ODN in both the laboratory and the clinic is needed before we can know their true promise as investigational immunological and therapeutic agents." (p. 461, col. 1) Krieg et al (Nature 1995; 374: 546-549) teaches that CpG has NK-stimulating properties and suggest that it can be used in immunotherapy of tumors, yet Krieg et al also indicates that many or even most types of tumors are relatively resistant to NK-mediated lysis (p. 117, col. 2). Ballas et al (J. Immunology 2001; 167: 4878) teaches that the selection of optimal CpG ODN for cancer immunotherapy depends upon a careful analysis of the cellular specificities of various CpG motifs and an understanding of the cellular mechanisms responsible for the antitumor activity in a particular tumor (abstract). Ballas et al teaches that a single CpG ODN cannot be used to treat all cancers and tumors. Although several CpG ODN were active as sole immunotherapeutic agents in two tumor models, different motifs were optimal in each model. CpG ODN 1585 was optimal against B 16 melanoma and its effects were dependent on NK cells. CpG ODN 1826 was optimal in a lymphoma model and its effects appeared to require NK (early) and T cells (late). These results illustrate that the potent distinct CpG motifs can be custom-tailored for each desired immune effect (p. 4878, col. 2; see also p. 4885, col. 1). Agrawal et al (TRENDS in Molecular Medicine, 2002, 8/3:114-120) also teaches that different effects are observed with different CpG ODNs. However,

the prior art appears to be silent on preferential killing of cancer cells over non-cancerous cells by CpG containing oligonucleotides or the structural requirements necessary for this function.

In the instant case, the structure of the oligonucleotide comprising at least two CpG moieties is vast in view of the recitation of the open claim language of "comprising" which indicates that there are other structural components to the claimed oligonucleotides. However, the structures of the additional nucleic acids in the oligonucleotides are not known. The oligonucleotides recited in the pending claimed genus would not clearly apprise one skilled in the art that the inventors of the claimed genus and all species encompassed thereby as of the filing date. The structures of these oligonucleotides has not been specifically defined. The claims recite that the oligonucleotide comprise at least two CpG moieties. However, the function of the other oligonucleotides is not known. The claims do not set forth the specific structure of the claimed oligonucleotide and it is not clear if the claims or specification give the structure and function of the oligonucleotide, as required by written description guidelines.

It is noted that the claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described where an invention is described solely in terms of a method of its making coupled with its function and there is no described or art-recognized correlation or relationship between the structure of the invention and its function. A biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence. An adequate written description of a chemical invention also requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, and not merely a wish or plan for obtaining the chemical invention claimed.

A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 93 F.3d 1559,1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); In re Ruschig, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967) ("Ifn-propylamine had been used in making the compound instead of n-butylamine, the compound of claim 13 would have resulted. Appellants submit to us, as they did to the board, an imaginary

specific example patterned on specific example 6 by which the above butyl compound is made so that we can see what a simple change would have resulted in a specific supporting disclosure being present in the present specification. The trouble is that there is no such disclosure, easy though it is to imagine it.") (emphasis in original); Purdue Pharma L.P.v. Faulding Inc., 230 F.3d 1320, 1328, 56 USPQ2d 1481, 1487 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("the specification does not clearly disclose to the skilled artisan that the inventors ... considered the ratio.., to be part of their invention .... There is therefore no force to Purdue's argument that the written description requirement was satisfied because the disclosure revealed a broad invention from which the [later-filed] claims carved out a patentable portion").

The claims are drawn to a vast genus of oligonucleotides. To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention.

MPEP § 2163.02 states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, 'does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed' ". The courts have decided: The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, whatever is now claimed. See Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "'Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including

description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of variant species, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The introduction of claim changes which involve narrowing the claims by introducing elements or limitations which are not supported by the as-filed disclosure is a violation of the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112,. first paragraph. See, e.g., Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); In re Ruschig, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967) ("Ifn-propylamine had been used in making the compound instead ofn-butylamine, the compound of claim 13 would have resulted. Appellants submit to us, as they did to the board, an imaginary specific example patterned on specific example 6 by which the above butyl compound is made so that we can see what a simple change would have resulted in a specific supporting disclosure being present in the present specification. The trouble is that there is no such disclosure, easy though it is to imagine it.") (emphasis in original). In Ex parte Ohshiro, 14 USPQ2d 1750 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), the Board affirmed the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, of claims to an internal combustion engine which recited "at least one of said piston and said cylinder (head) having a recessed channel." The Board held that the application, which disclosed a cylinder head with a recessed channel and a piston without a recessed channel did not specifically disclose the "species" of a channeled piston.

Claims 36-37 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in Wands states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' " (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the relative skill of those in the art, (3) the breadth of the claims, (4) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (5) the presence or absence of working examples, (6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (7) the state of the prior art, and (8) the predictability or unpredictability of the art.

Although the quantity of experimentation alone is not dispositive in a determination of whether the required experimentation is undue, this factor does play a central role. For example, a very limited quantity of experimentation may be undue in a fledgling art that is unpredictable where no guidance or working examples are provided in the specification and prior art, whereas the same amount of experimentation may not be undue when viewed in light of some guidance or a working example or the experimentation required is in a predictable established art. Conversely, a large quantity of experimentation would require a correspondingly greater quantum of guidance, predictability and skill in the art to overcome classification as undue experimentation. In Wands, the determination that undue experimentation was not required to make the claimed invention was based primarily on the nature of the art, and the probability that the required experimentation would result in successfully obtaining the claimed invention. (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1406) Thus, a combination of factors which, when viewed together, would provide an artisan of ordinary skill in

the art with an expectation of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation would preclude the classification of that experimentation as undue. A combination of Wands factors, which provide a very low likelihood of successfully obtaining the claimed invention with additional experimentation, however, would render the additional experimentation undue.

***The nature of the invention***

The claims are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a therapeutically effective amount of the oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells. The invention is in a class of invention which the CAFC has characterized as "the unpredictable arts such as chemistry and biology." Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 243 F.3d 1316, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

***Level of skill in the art***

The level of skill in the art is deemed to be high, generally that of a PhD or MD.

***The breadth of the claims***

Applicants broadly claim a pharmaceutical composition comprising a therapeutically effective amount of the oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells. Thus, due to the use of the term "pharmaceutical", the claims encompass in vivo use the claimed composition for the treatment of cancer.

***Guidance in the specification and Working Examples***

The specification teaches (paragraph 0017) that the present invention provides an oligonucleotide for preferentially killing cancerous cells over non-cancerous cells. For example, the specification teaches that ODN's linked to 2'deoxy, 2', 2'-difluorocytidine killed colon cancerous cells HT29 much more effectively than by treatment with Gemzar, e.g, 2'deoxy, 2',2'-diflurocytidine. (page 54 and Fig. 13). Thus, while the specification reasonably conveys a nexus between claimed oligonucleotide and cell killing efficacy in vitro, the specification appears to be silent on any correlation between the in vitro testing and in vivo success. As such, if there is no correlation then the examples do not constitute working examples. While it is understood that the absence of working examples should never be the sole reason for rejecting a claims as being broader than an enabling disclosure, the criticality of working examples in an unpredictable art, such as the treatment of cancer, is required for practice of the claimed invention.

***Quantity of experimentation***

The quantity of experimentation in the areas of cancer therapy is extremely large given the unpredictability associated with treating cancer in general and the lack of correlation of in vitro findings to in vivo success, and the fact that no known cure or preventive regimen is currently available for cancer.

***The unpredictability of the art and the state of the prior art***

The state of the art indicates that cancer therapy is unpredictable, in addition CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid molecules in cancer therapy is unpredictable. Donnelly et al (Nature Medicine, 2003, 9/11:1354-1356) teaches that over many decades various approaches to eliciting both innate and acquired immune responses against tumors have been tried, some with a degree of success. However, immunotherapy has yet to be incorporated into first-line therapies for more than a very few types of cancers such as the use of IL-2 immunotherapy for metastatic renal cell carcinoma (p. 1354, col. 2). Further, Donnelly teaches that treating cancer with something that looks more like a modern-day vaccine, with a defined antigen and an optimized adjuvant and delivery platform, is still in the future (see p. 1354, col. 2; see also col. 3). "A variety of anti-tumor vaccine clinical trials have been undertaken. In spite of the large number of these trials, and the plethora of distinct approaches investigated, there has been little evidence of clinical efficacy. Furthermore, precise correlates of clinical effects and immunological responses have been lacking." (DeGruijl et al, Nature Medicine, 1999, 5/10:1124-1125, see p. 1124, col. 1) Bitton R. J. (Current Opinion in Molecular Therapeutics, 2004, 6/1:17-25) teaches that developing cancer vaccines to treat solid tumors is not an easy task (abstract). Bitton teaches that "immune editing", in part, explains why many cancer vaccines work in animal models but not in a clinical setting (abstract). Bitton describes the various cancer vaccine strategies and evaluates the evidence supporting their efficacy (abstract). Bitton indicates that the final picture with regard to cancer vaccines is confusing and comparison of different vaccine strategies is almost impossible because of the different strategies from different groups. Further, most of the vaccines are still experimental, far from being approved by regulatory authorities and their clinical utility is almost negligible (abstract). Bitton teaches that therapeutic vaccines have proved to have little use in cancer treatment and that in fact in almost every well-designed, well-controlled, randomized phase III trial, they have failed to demonstrate any significant improvement in overall or disease-flee survival (p. 17, col. 2; Table 2). "It is clear that most vaccines

are indeed effective immunogens, but they do not seem to be effective at triggering anticancer responses. Tumor size reduction, the classic endpoint in clinical development of cytotoxic drugs does not seem to be useful in evaluating cancer vaccines; tumor stabilization might be more valuable. Finally, there is no evidence of improvement in overall survival or disease-flee survival. The implementation of well-designed randomized phase III trials is urgently required." (pp. 24-25) This is just an example of the state of the art for cancer treatments.

With regard to CpG in the treatment of cancers, Weiner indicates that there is therapeutic potential in cancer treatment for CpG as an immune adjuvant (Table 1) and that there are a number of scenarios where CpG could be used as a component of cancer immunotherapy, each of these areas is under intensive investigation (p. 458, col. 1). Studies in a tumor model (38C13 murine lymphoma) indicate that CpG was just as effective as CFA at inducing an antigen-specific antibody response (p. 458, col. 2). Weiner teaches that "[P]reliminary studies suggest CpG ODN can be effective in a variety of scenarios when used alone or in combination with other agents. Despite this promise we still do not understand the molecular mechanisms responsible for the immunostimulatory effects of CpG ODN. All CpG ODN are not alike, and more needs to be learned about the heterogeneous responses that occur based on host organism, cell subset, or CpG ODN sequence. Most importantly, we have not yet explored their clinical effects. Further work with CpG ODN in both the laboratory and the clinic is needed before we can know their true promise as investigational immunological and therapeutic agents." (p. 461, col. 1) Krieg et al teaches that CpG has NK-stimulating properties and suggest that it can be used in immunotherapy of tumors, yet Krieg et al also indicates that many or even most types of tumors are relatively resistant to NK-mediated lysis (p. 117, col. 2). Ballas et al teaches that the selection of optimal CpG ODN for cancer immunotherapy depends upon a careful analysis of the cellular specificities of various CpG motifs and an understanding of the cellular mechanisms responsible for the antitumor activity in a particular tumor (abstract). Ballas et al teaches that a single CpG ODN cannot be used to treat all cancers and tumors. Although several CpG ODN were active as sole immunotherapeutic agents in two tumor models, different motifs were optimal in each model. CpG ODN 1585 was optimal against B 16 melanoma and its effects were dependent on NK cells. CpG ODN 1826 was optimal in a lymphoma model and its effects appeared to require NK (early) and T cells (late). These results illustrate that the potent distinct CpG motifs can be custom-tailored for each desired immune effect

(p. 4878, col. 2; see also p. 4885, col. 1). Agrawal et al (TRENDS in Molecular Medicine, 2002, 8/3:114-120) also teaches that different effects are observed with different CpG ODNs.

Furthermore, those of skill in the art recognize that *in vitro* assays and or cell-cultured based assays are generally useful to observe basic physiological and cellular phenomenon such as screening the effects of potential drugs. However, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the *in vivo* environment as compared to the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an *in- vitro* assay does not permit a single extrapolation of *in vitro* assays to human diagnostic efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability. *In vitro* assays cannot easily assess cell-cell interactions that may be important in a particular pathological state. Furthermore it is well known in the art that cultured cells, over a period time, lose phenotypic characteristics associated with their normal counterpart cell type. Freshney (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New York, p4) teach that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between cultured cells and their counterparts *in vivo*. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a three-dimensional geometry and their propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation *in vivo*. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant *in vitro* but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light (p. 4, see Major Differences In Vitro). Further, Dermer (Bio/Technology, 1994, 12:320) teaches that, petri dish cancer" is a poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from the human disease. Dermer teaches that when a normal or malignant body cell adapts to immortal life in culture, it takes an evolutionary type step that enables the new line to thrive in its artificial environment. This step transforms a cell from one that is stable and differentiated to one that is not. Yet normal or malignant cells *in vivo* are not like that. The reference states that evidence of the contradictions between life on the bottom of a lab dish and in the body has been in the scientific literature for more than 30 years. Clearly it is well known in the art that cells in culture exhibit characteristics different from those *in vivo* and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of the *in vivo* environment involved in host-tumor and cell-cell interactions.

***Conclusion***

Thus given the broad claims in an art whose nature is identified as unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the lack of guidance provided in the specification for defining what synergy means, and the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to perform the method of the claim as written.

Therefore, NO claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. FETTEROLF whose telephone number is (571)272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF

/Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642